

REMARKS

This is intended as a full and complete response to the Office Action dated February 28, 2007, having a shortened statutory period for response set to expire on December 6, 2006. Please reconsider the claims pending in the application for reasons discussed below.

Claims 1-19 are pending in the application. Claims 1-19 remain pending following entry of this response. Claims 1 and 8 have been amended. Applicant submits that the amendments and new claims do not introduce new matter.

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-5, and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Muller* (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,418) in view of *Welch et al.* (U.S. Patent No. 6,735,633 81, hereinafter, "*Welch*"), and in further view of *Mammen* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0047367).

Claims 6 and 8-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the combined teachings of *Muller*, *Welch* and *Mammen*, and in further view of *Gil* (U.S. Publication No. 2004/0064664).

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

The Examiner bears the initial burden of establishing a *prima facie* case of obviousness. See MPEP § 2142. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness three basic criteria must be met. First, there must be some suggestion or motivation, either in the references themselves or in the knowledge generally available to one ordinary skill in the art, to modify the reference or to combine the reference teachings. Second, there must be a reasonable expectation of success. Third, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. See MPEP § 2143. The present rejection fails to establish at least the third criterion.

For example, the references, even when combined as suggested in the *Office Action*, fail to teach the use of a logic network that “writes and reads data from a plurality of unique data classes into said plurality of buffer regions such that each data class is uniquely written into and uniquely read from a different buffer region,” as recited in independent claims 1 and 8.

The recited step allows each data class, i.e. the data associated with only one network, to be separately and uniquely stored in its own portion of the data buffer memory space. In contrast, none of the references teaches the assignment of each network’s data to a corresponding and separate data class, much less the separate and unique storage of each data class in its own portion of the data buffer memory space, as recited in the claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that claims 1 and 8, as well as their dependants, are allowable and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested

Conclusion

Having addressed all issues set out in the office action, Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully requests that the claims be allowed.

Respectfully submitted, and
S-signed pursuant to 37 CFR 1.4,

/Randol W. Read, Reg. No. 43,876/
Randol W. Read
Registration No. 43,876
PATTERSON & SHERIDAN, L.L.P.
3040 Post Oak Blvd. Suite 1500
Houston, TX 77056
Telephone: (713) 623-4844
Facsimile: (713) 623-4846
Attorney for Applicant